



# *Chesterfield County* **Board Bits**

**Board of Supervisors**  
Kelly E. Miller  
Edward B. Barber  
Renny Bush Humphrey  
R. M. "Dickie" King, Jr.  
Arthur S. Warren

**County Administrator**  
Lane B. Ramsey

## **Summary of Actions Taken by the Board on June 25, 2004 at the Growth Management Work Session**

### **ITEMS APPROVED AT WORK SESSION**

"Increase cash proffer amount to include up to 100% of the cost of development impact on public facilities. (\$9,000 to \$11,549 maximum)"

Action: Approved increase in maximum cash proffer to \$11,500 effective June 28, 2004. We did not ask the Board to specifically increase the past cash proffers by the Marshall-Swift index. We will include that on the July Board agenda.

"(i) Accept 100% of cash proffer for residential development in deferred growth areas; (ii) recognize 'credit' for infill development based on the availability of the existing capital improvements; and (iii) recognize 'credit' for phased or delayed residential development in deferred growth area. (So-called differential cash proffer)"

Action: Send to Planning Commission to study and prepare a recommendation for the Board of Supervisors by December 31, 2004.

"Update transportation methodology to recognize current understandings that residential growth generates automobile traffic typically allocated to commercial growth."

Action: Send to Planning Commission to study and prepare a recommendation for the Board of Supervisors by December 31, 2004.

"Eliminate concept of 'density credits' for lots that could be built under 'old' zoning or road stripping"

Action: Approved change in cash proffer policy and included requirement that any rezonings with updated development standards would normally constitute a reason to reduce the number of lots eligible for cash proffers.

“Change policy to calculate cash proffer amount at time Board makes zoning decision rather than at time of application for zoning”

Action: Send to Planning Commission to study and prepare a recommendation for the Board of Supervisors by December 31, 2004.

“Add a road improvement question to bond referendum in November 2004 which identifies prioritized projects covering the entire county which would necessitate \$35-40 million in borrowing”

Action: Approved adding question to November 2004 bond referendum for \$40,000,000 in road improvement projects to be considered at a public hearing at the July 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

“Expand program to loan County funds to VDOT in order to “advance” road construction and “refund” money to County in later years of state funding. The County currently is “loaning” \$1 million to build a westbound lane on Rte. 360 from Swift Creek to Winterpock. VDOT would not have undertaken the project, if at all, before 2008-2009. The proceeds from a November bond issue could be used for this purpose. 2005 General Assembly legislation could facilitate cooperation between VDOT staff and County”

Action: Approved adding to 2005 General Assembly legislative package an item requiring VDOT to participate in local government “loans” to accelerate road improvements and insuring that the “loan” would be repaid in future VDOT allocations.

“Upgrade residential development standards and establish differential development standards. Mandate additional improvements such as sidewalks, curb and gutter, parkway entrances, streetscape improvements and street lights, for residential developments”

Action: Send to Planning Commission to study and prepare a recommendation for the Board of Supervisors without a priority deadline.

“Eliminate R-12 zoning category”

Action: Send to Planning Commission to be considered by the differential cash proffer committee without a priority deadline. The Planning Commission should consider the possibility of tailoring the elimination of R-12 to “hot spots”.

“Eliminate opportunities to exempt new development from requirements to connect with adjacent areas. Lack of connectivity increases demand to improve other roads”

Action: Work session scheduled at the Board of Supervisors meeting on July 28, 2004 re: the Connectivity Policy.

“Increase requirements as preconditions to using ‘family subdivisions’ in order to avoid abuses by developers seeking to avoid requirements of subdivision ordinance”

Action: Public hearing to consider revisions to be held on July 28, 2004

“Create new zoning category for emerging ‘urbanism’ residential designs”

Action: Staff to prepare a recommendation for consideration by the Planning Commission.

“Expand cash proffers to subdivisions by accepting cash proffers for roads as part of subdivision approval. Program should be coupled with enactment of enhanced level of service requirements for subdivision roads. Subdivider could provide off-site improvements or elect to proffer cash”

Action: Staff to prepare a draft and send to Planning Commission for consideration.

“Comprehensive rezoning of Agricultural in deferred growth area and all high-density residential to new ‘Residential Plus’ zoning category providing for residential and commercial/office development depending on compliance with specified development criteria. Example: High density residential permitted in new R-P zone only if roads kept at level B for 20 years. Lower density permitted with level C. Service level D for commercial. Would require change to comprehensive plan”

Action: Staff to prepare a draft and send to Planning Commission for consideration.

“Modify rate of residential growth based on infrastructure capacity or based on level of commercial development/number of jobs created by proposed development. Establish ‘tip point’ criteria which trigger greater growth control measures. If residential growth rate exceeds 2.5%, require roads to be at B level of service for 20 years, require 6 minute fire/EMS response, or require maximum 0.22 pounds total phosphorus loading per acre, per year in order to obtain zoning”

Action: Staff to prepare options for consideration by the Board of Supervisors that would then be sent to the Planning Commission.

“Increase setback requirements for side yards in residential zoning districts. Although this would not affect minimum lot sizes, developers would often need to increase the size of particular lots in order to meet the increased set back, resulting in fewer developable lots.”

Action: Staff to prepare options in R-7 and R-9 to be considered by the Planning Commission.

“Reduce ‘road stripping’ by increasing mandatory road frontage from 250 feet to 500 feet.”

Action: Staff to review road frontage/road stripping as well as “flag lot” issue for a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

### **ISSUES NOT APPROVED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

“Revise land use portion of the County’s comprehensive plan to provide maximum densities in certain areas coupled with a 12-month deferral of all residential cases to provide time to consider any recommendations”

Action: No action taken.

“Accelerate payment of cash proffers to subdivision recordation stage rather than at building permit stage”

Action: No action taken.

“Adoption of a meals tax to fund infrastructure improvements. 1¢ increase results in \$2,400,000”

Action: No action taken.

“Implement ‘payment in lieu of taxes’ policy for Utilities Department facilities to help fund County capital needs created by growth. Anticipate generating approximately \$1.2 million annually”

Action: No action taken.

“Exclude undevelopable acreage from minimum lot sizes. For example, land encumbered by Resource Protection Areas, steep slopes, transmission lines, easements, etc., while included in a lot, would not count towards satisfying the minimum lot size. This would result in fewer lots per subdivision”

Action: No action taken.

“Eliminate all county contributions within sewer and water extension policy for offsite extensions or oversizing. Loss of refunds to developers would be about \$350,000 per year”

Action: No action taken.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m. until July 28, 2004 at 3:00 p.m. for the next regularly scheduled meeting in the Public Meeting Room.